

**Remarks:**

Claims 1-21 and 31-37 were previously and are currently pending in the application with claims 1, 10, 16, 31, 32, and 36 being independent.

The Examiner indicated that claims 32-37 are allowed.

The Examiner objected to claim 2. Specifically, the “Examiner does not see how the second mounting frame is coupled between the electronic module and the first mounting frame.” Page 2 of the July 26, 2007 Office Action. However, figures 1B and 1C show, and the specification’s discussion thereof describe, the electronic modules 130 within the second mounting frames 120 and the second mounting frames 120 within the first mounting frame 100. Thus, the second mounting frame is coupled between the electronic module and the first mounting frame, as claimed. As a result, claim 2 is proper and amendment is therefore not required.

The Examiner also asserted that the phrase “global positioning system (GPS),” as used by applicant, constitutes a trademark and therefore objected to claim 19. Page 2 of the July 26, 2007 Office Action. Applicant disagrees. The phrase “global positioning system (GPS),” as used by applicant, is not a trademark. The Examiner does not support this assertion nor can the Applicant find any support. Specifically, a search of the USPTO’s TESS database indicated that, while there are many trademarks that include the acronym “GPS,” there are none comprising only the phrase “global positioning system (GPS),” as used by applicant. Rather, “GPS” is merely an acronym for “global positioning system,” which is a generic term for the positioning system developed and maintained by the United States Government. Thus, the phrase “global positioning system (GPS),” as used by applicant, is not a trademark and therefore does not require any special treatment in the instant specification. As a result, claim 19 is proper and amendment is therefore not required.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 16-18, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moss et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,144,549. The Examiner also rejected claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss in view of Revis, U.S. Patent No. 6,359,775. The Examiner also rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss. Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims distinguish the present

invention from Moss, Revis, and the other prior art references of record, taken alone or in combination with each other.

Claim 1 recites “a display unit having a display screen located directly in front of the electronic module and in communication with the electronic module, the display unit having a first range of mounting locations with respect to the electronic module, wherein the display screen remains usable and directly in front of the electronic module throughout the first range of mounting locations.” More specifically, claim 1 requires that “*the* display screen” both remain “usable **and** directly in front of the electronic module throughout the first range of mounting locations.”

The Examiner acknowledges that Moss not disclose a display unit located directly in front of electronic modules, the display unit having a range of mounting locations with respect to the electronic modules. *See Page 6 of the July 26, 2007 Office Action.* Rather, as previously argued, Moss’s display screens 140,240 both rotate about a pivot point 160. As Moss’ pivot point is “directly in front of the electronic module” 190, the display screens 140,240 themselves can never be “directly in front of the electronic module” 190 in either their upper or lower positions. Furthermore, no single display screen is usable in more than one mounting location. For example, the Examiner points to Moss’ figures 1 and 2, to show a range of mounting locations. Specifically, Moss’ figure 1 shows his display screens 140,240 rotated downwards, wherein the display screens 140,240 are below the electronic module 190. In this position, display screen 240 is unusable because it is hidden, and therefore a user is forced to rely on display screen 140. Similarly, Moss’ figure 2 shows his display screens 140,240 rotated upwards, wherein the display screens 140,240 are above the electronic module 190. In this position, display screen 140 is unusable because it is hidden, and therefore a user is forced to rely on display screen 240. Thus, in neither of these positions is either one of Moss’ display screens 140, 240 “directly in front of the electronic module” 190. Rather, they are either above or below the module 190. Additionally, each of Moss’ display screens 140,240 are only usable in one of the mounting locations. As a result, Moss does not disclose, suggest, or make obvious “a display unit having a display screen located directly in front of the electronic module and in communication with the electronic module, the display unit having a first range of mounting locations with respect to the electronic module, wherein the display screen remains usable and

directly in front of the electronic module throughout the first range of mounting locations,” as claimed in claim 1.

Claim 2 recites “a second mounting frame coupled between the electronic module and the first mounting frame along a second range of mounting locations with respect to the first mounting frame.” Similarly, claim 9 recites “wherein the second range of mounting locations includes a horizontal range of mounting locations.” For example, figure 1C, of the present specification, shows an example of this relationship. Similarly, figure 1D, of the present specification, shows an example of the overall relationship between the electronic modules and the display. Specifically, in the above referenced examples, the display may be mounted anywhere along the first range 104 and the electronic modules may be mounted anywhere along the second range 108.

In the September 9, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Moss does not disclose these limitations. However, the Examiner now contends that Moss does disclose these limitations. Applicant disagrees. Nowhere does Moss disclose or suggest any horizontal range of mounting locations. Rather, Moss merely discloses a single vertical range of mounting locations. As a result, Moss fails to disclose, suggest, or make obvious “a second mounting frame coupled between the electronic module and the first mounting frame along a second range of mounting locations with respect to the first mounting frame,” as claimed in claim 2, or “wherein the second range of mounting locations includes a horizontal range of mounting locations,” as claimed in claim 9.

Claim 4 recites “wherein the mounting surface includes a cockpit instrument panel.” Similarly, claim 12 recites “wherein the avionic mounting surface includes a cockpit instrument panel.” Finally, claim 17 recites “wherein the avionic mounting surface includes a cockpit instrument panel.” In contrast, neither Moss nor Revis even includes the words “cockpit,” “instrument,” or “avionic.” Specifically, rather than being directed to an avionic instrument mounting system, as claimed in these claims, Moss and Revis are both directed to modules for personal computers. As a result, Moss does not disclose, suggest, or make obvious “wherein the mounting surface includes a cockpit instrument panel,” as claimed in claim 4, or “wherein the avionic mounting surface includes a cockpit instrument panel,” as claimed in claims 12 and 17.

Claim 10 recites “a second mounting frame coupled to each of the electronic modules and coupled to the first mounting frame along a module range of mounting locations with respect to the first mounting frame” and “a display unit located directly in front of the plurality of electronic modules and in communication with the electronic modules, the display unit having a display range of mounting locations with respect to the electronic modules.” Thus, claim 10 requires that the electronic modules be mounted “along a module range of mounting locations” and the display have “a display range of mounting locations.” Simply put, claim 10 requires two ranges, one range for the electronic modules and one range for the display. Finally, claim 10 also requires the display to be “located directly in front of the plurality of electronic modules.”

The Examiner acknowledges that “Moss et al does not disclose a display unit located directly in front of the plurality of electronic modules and in communication with the electronic modules, the display unit having a display range of mounting locations with respect to the electronic modules.” Page 6 of the July 26, 2007 Office Action. However, the Examiner mistakenly relies on Revis to show this limitation. As shown in his figures, Revis’ display 128 is located to the side of his electronic modules 166,168. While Revis’ display is located in front of the internal components of his unit, those internal components are fixedly mounted and do not have any “range of mounting locations.” Simply put, Revis does not disclose “a display unit [having a display range of mounting locations with respect to the electronic modules] and located directly in front of the plurality of electronic modules [themselves having a module range of mounting locations],” as claimed in claim 10.

Furthermore, Revis does not teach any display “located directly in front of the plurality of electronic modules.” Rather, Revis only teaches his display 128 being located in front of one electronic module, namely his motherboard 132, which does not have any “range of mounting locations.”

Finally, Revis’ display 128 is only **mounted** when in the position shown in figure 1. When in the position shown in figure 3, Revis’ display 128 is loosely rotatable about hinge 124, thereby moving from “directly in front of” the motherboard 132, and is certainly not **mounted**. Thus, Revis’ display 128 only has one true **mounting** location directly in front of **an** electronic module. In any

case, Revis' motherboard 132 may only be mounted in one location, and therefore cannot be a surrogate for "the plurality of electronic modules [having a module range of mounting locations]," as claimed in claim 10. As a result, no combination of Moss and/or Revis discloses, suggests, or makes obvious "a second mounting frame coupled to each of the electronic modules and coupled to the first mounting frame along a module range of mounting locations with respect to the first mounting frame" and "a display unit located directly in front of the plurality of electronic modules and in communication with the electronic modules, the display unit having a display range of mounting locations with respect to the electronic modules," as claimed in claim 10.

Claim 11 recites "wherein a front face of each electronic module includes a long axis and a short axis, and wherein each electronic module is coupled to the second frame with the long axis oriented vertically." In contrast, as previously argued, both Moss and Revis show and describe just the opposite. Specifically, their electronic modules are shown and described as having a long axis oriented horizontally. As a result, no combination of Moss and/or Revis discloses, suggests, or makes obvious "wherein a front face of each electronic module includes a long axis and a short axis, and wherein each electronic module is coupled to the second frame with the long axis oriented vertically," as claimed in claim 11.

Claim 14 recites "wherein the plurality of electronic modules is coupled behind the avionic mounting surface." In contrast, neither Moss nor Revis discloses any "avionic mounting surface," and therefore cannot make obvious mounting anything there behind. Furthermore, the Examiner's assertion that "the plurality of electronic modules (190 and 325) is coupled behind the mounting surface (mounting surface of the chassis 310)" is mistaken. As shown in figure 3, Moss's modules 190,325 extend well beyond the chassis 310. As a result, no combination of Moss and/or Revis discloses, suggests, or makes obvious "wherein the plurality of electronic modules are coupled behind the avionic mounting surface," as claimed in claim 14.

Claims 15 and 21 each recite "wherein the module range of mounting locations includes a horizontal range of mounting locations." Therefore, these claims require that the electronic modules are coupled to the first frame along a "horizontal range of mounting locations." It was previously noted that mounting electronic modules along a vertical range is the current industry practice.

Therefore, mounting electronic modules along a horizontal range is a significant departure from current industry practice.

As previously argued, both Moss and Revis show and describe the current practice; albeit, in a completely different industry. Specifically, both Moss and Revis are concerned with the personal computer industry, rather than the avionics industry of the present invention. However, on this issue, both industries follow the same practice. In each case, the prior art electronic modules are shown and described as being mounted along a vertical range of mounting locations. As a result, no combination of Moss and/or Revis discloses, suggests, or makes obvious “wherein the module range of mounting locations includes a horizontal range of mounting locations,” as claimed in claims 15 and 21.

Claim 16 recites “wherein the module range of mounting locations is arranged substantially perpendicular to the display range of mounting locations.” In contrast, the Examiner’s assertions concerning Moss reflect just the opposite. For example, Moss shows and discloses his electronic modules being mounted along a vertical range. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that Moss shows his display having vertical movement along a vertical range. *See* Page 4 of the July 26, 2007 Office Action. Therefore, The Examiner’s position is that Moss shows the ranges of both the electronic modules and the displays as parallel, rather than “substantially perpendicular” as claimed in claim 16. As a result, Moss does not disclose, suggest, or make obvious “wherein the module range of mounting locations is arranged substantially perpendicular to the display range of mounting locations,” as claimed in claim 16.

While the Summary Page of the July 26, 2007 Office Action lists claim 31 as being rejected, the Examiner fails to address claim 31 anywhere in the body of the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant understands the Summary page to be in error. Thus, Applicant understands claim 31 to have been allowed.

The remaining claims all depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 10, or 16, and are therefore also allowable.

Application No. 10/086,483  
Amendment dated September 26, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2007

Any additional fee which is due in connection with this amendment should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 501-791. In view of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance appears to be in order and such is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Kevin E. West/  
Kevin E. West, Reg. No. 43,983  
Garmin International, Inc.  
1200 East 151<sup>st</sup> Street  
Olathe, KS 66062  
(913) 397-8200  
(913) 397-8282 (Fax)